



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/550,249	09/23/2005	Stephan Fazeny	TRODAT 3.3-001	1888		
530	7590	06/26/2009	EXAMINER			
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090				EVANS, GEOFFREY S		
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER				
3742						
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE				
06/26/2009		PAPER				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/550,249	FAZENY, STEPHAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Geoffrey S. Evans	3742	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-44 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-25 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 26-44 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 26-32,34,35,40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chapman in U.S. patent No. 4,900,379. Chapman discloses an apparatus with a support device (element 102, see column2 ,lines 49-52) , a material removing unit (cutting head element 204) and a handling unit for moving the material removing unit in the X-Y plane (see column 4,lines 13-27). Chapman further discloses an ink dispensing unit (marking head 402, see column 5,lines 19-23). Chapman further discloses that the ink-jet marking gantry may be combined with the water jet cutting gantry (see column 6,lines 31-35). Implicitly an ink- jet marking dispenser will have at least one outlet orifice and one discharge passage. Regarding the amendments to claim 26 of 11 March 2009, the language “for processing composite components” in the preamble is merely a statement of intended use. Product limitations of “a stamp pad” have no patentable weight in an apparatus claim. The last four lines of claim 26 recite process limitations that have no patentable weight in an apparatus claim.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 33 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman in view of Tanigawa in Japan Patent No. 9-30,907. Tanigawa teaches using multiple dispensers to dispense multiple colors of ink. It would have been obvious to adapt Chapman in view of Tanigawa to provide this to quickly create a multi-colored marking on the workpiece.

5. Claims 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman in view of Yamaguchi et al. in Japan Patent No. 10-193,635. Yamaguchi et al. teaches a pressure controlled metering device for a ink jet marker. It would have been obvious to adapt Chapman in view of Yamaguchi et al. to provide this to control the metering of ink from the dispenser.

6. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman in view of Abramchenko et al. in Soviet Union Patent document No. 1,689,473. Abramchenko et al. teach using a shut off valve to provide a fluid tight seal of a ink chamber dispenser. It would have been obvious to adapt Chapman in view of Abramchenko et al. to provide this to cut off the dispensing of ink.

7. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman in view of Klingel et al. in U.S. Patent No. 5,132,510. Klingel et al teach using a computer control unit (element 28, see column 6,lines 34-53) to control motors to move a carriage along a gantry (see figure 1). This would require a memory to store software to operate the computer. It would have been obvious to adapt Chapman in view of Klingel et al. to provide this to control movement of the dispenser and the cutting element along a gantry.

8. Claims 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman in view of Herman Jr. in U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0002416. Herman Jr. teaches an input (e.g. keyboard in figure 1) for a gantry controlled cutting device and the equivalence of laser cutting implement and a water jet cutting implement (see paragraph 26). It would have been obvious to adapt Chapman in view of Herman Jr. to provide an input unit to allow the user to flexibly control the cutting process and to alternatively provide a laser cutting device as a functionally equivalent method of cutting a workpiece.

9. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The language 'wherein the stamp pad of the composite components at least partially joined to the support device is divided into several pad parts spaced at a distance apart from one another by means of a dividing gap by the material removal unit" is a recitation of a method that does not give patentable weight to an apparatus claim.

10. Claims 1-13 and 15-25 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Geoffrey S. Evans whose telephone number is (571)-272-1174. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tu Hoang can be reached on (571)-272-4780. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Geoffrey S Evans/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3742